Counterfactual quantum erasure

Hatim Salih[1, *]

[1] *Qubet Research, 63 Lotherington Mews, York YO10 3TZ, UK*

(Dated: June 14, 2016)

We combine the eyebrow-raising phenomena of counterfactuality and erasure, proposing a quantum eraser that works counterfactually: Bob erases which-path information from Alice's photon, restoring interference, without previously-shared entanglement, and intriguingly, without Alice's photon ever leaving her station.

Keywords: quantum interference; entanglement; quantum erasure; interaction-free measurement; Zeno effect; counterfactual communication

arXiv:1606.03081v2 [quant-ph] 11 Jun 2016

Quantum erasure was first proposed by Scully and Druhl more than three decades ago [1], sending shockwaves through the physics community. While early debates on double-slit interference, going back to Bohr and Einstein [2], focussed on Heisenberg's uncertainty principle as preventing one from learning which slit a particle went through as well as observing interference, quantum erasure put the focus on entanglement instead, a concept brought to light by Einstein and colleagues in their EPR paper [3]. Scully and Druhl showed that it is possible to place a which-path tag on individual particles passing through a double-slit interferometer without disturbing it, thus throwing the uncertainty principle out of the discussion. Interference, however, is lost because entanglement provides which-path information. The mere possibility of obtaining such information is enough to destroy interference. Erasing which-path information, even after the particles have long been detected, dramatically restores interference, seemingly allowing one to edit the past [4–6].

Practically, quantum erasure has recently been used to entangle, for the first time, two different-colour photons [7], and more recently, to design a protocol for quantum key distribution (QKD) promising inherent security against detector attacks [8].

Counterfactuality, on the other hand, gleans information from events that could have happened but did not in fact take place. But information is physical—it is always manifested in physical form. The basic idea behind our present scheme is that information counterfactually communicated from Bob to Alice—that is without any particles travelling between them—can be made to manifest itself as a flip in the polarisation of Alice's photon. This allows us to combine the two phenomena of erasure and counterfactuality, proposing a simple yet unusual quantum eraser.

Let's start with the Michelson interferometer of FIG. 1. Alice's horizontally polarised H-photon, emitted by photon source S, encounters beam-splitter BS, which puts it in an equal superposition of traveling upwards towards mirror MR_A, and traveling to the right towards Bob's mirror, MR_B. These two components are reflected by mirrors MR_A and MR_B back to BS. By means of switchable polarisation rotator SPR, the polarisation of the part of the superposition incident on BS from above can be flipped to V. There are two scenarios. First, if the polarisation of the part of the superposition incident on BS from above is not flipped, by not applying SPR, no which-path information is available. Interference takes place, with detector D_2 always clicking. Second, if the polarisation of the part of the superposition incident on BS from above is flipped to V by applying SPR appropriately, which-path information is imprinted. Interference does not takes place, with detectors D_1 and D_2 equally likely to click.

We now unveil counterfactual erasure. Using the chained quantum Zeno effect (CQZE) [9–12], whose inner working is explained in detail in FIG. 2, Bob can remotely flip the polarisation of the part of the photon superposition travelling towards MR_B by merely blocking the channel, without Alice's photon at any point leaving her station, as illustrated in FIG. 3.

Crucially, which-path information can be totally erased, thus restoring complete destructive interference at D_1. For a large enough number of inner cycles N (with the number of outer cycles $M \ll N$) and given ideal implementation, detector D_2 virtually always clicks.

Note that had Bob chosen not to block the channel, the polarisation of the part of the photon superposition travelling towards MR_B would not have been flipped by CQZE [10]. Erasure of which-path information would not have taken place and interference would not have been restored, with D_1 and D_2 equally likely to click.

The CQZE relies on two quantum phenomena, interaction-free measurement and the quantum Zeno effect. In interaction-free measurement the mere presence of an obstructing object inside an interferometer destroys interference, allowing the object's presence to sometimes be inferred without interacting with any particle. The quantum Zeno effect on the other hand refers to the fact that repeated measurement of an evolving quantum object inhibits its

* hatim.salih@york.ac.uk

evolution, an effect that brings to mind the proverbial watched kettle that never boils. The quantum Zeno effect is used here to push the efficiency of interaction-free measurement towards unity.

The counterfactuality of the CQZE is based on the fact that any photon going into the channel is necessarily lost; photons detected at D_1 or D_2 could not have therefore travelled to Bob. From FIG. 3, counterfactuality is ensured: had the photon gone into the channel, detector D_B would have clicked.

While counterfactuality has been questioned for the case of Bob not blocking the channel (based on weak measurements that are known to sometimes give strange results such as faster-than-light speeds), counterfactuality for the case of Bob blocking the channel, which is what brings about quantum erasure here, is not disputed [13–15].

The fact that quantum erasure is brought about by Bob blocking the channel may at first sight suggest that the chaining of the Zeno effect, in other words having the outer cycles, is not needed—since the outer cycles were introduced in the first place only to ensure counterfactuality for the case of Bob not blocking. The case of Bob blocking is already counterfactual. The problem however is that without the outer cycles the scenario is reversed: polarisation is not flipped for Bob blocking. The chained quantum Zeno effect is therefore necessary.

The CQZE employs N inner cycles nested within M outer cycles. While, as can be inferred from the explanation in the caption of FIG. 3, a smaller number of outer cycles does not lead to more output errors, a smaller number of inner cycles does lead to more output errors. The larger N is, the closer to V the polarisation of the part of the photon superposition travelling towards MR_B is rotated, the more perfect the erasure. For a given M and N, for the case of Bob blocking, the error can be obtained from the following recursion relations [10],

$$X[m,N] = \cos(\frac{\pi}{2M})X[m-1] - \sin(\frac{\pi}{2M})\cos^N(\frac{\pi}{2N})Y[m-1]. \tag{1}$$

$$Y[m,N] = \sin(\frac{\pi}{2M})X[m-1] + \cos(\frac{\pi}{2M})\cos^N(\frac{\pi}{2N})Y[m-1]. \tag{2}$$

where $X[M,N]$ and $Y[M,N]$ are the unnormalised probability amplitudes for the H and V components exiting the CQZE respectively, with $X[M,N]$ being the error term causing detector D_1 to incorrectly click.

The quality of erasure can be measured by interference visibility, defined as $\frac{I_{max}-I_{min}}{I_{max}+I_{min}}$, where I_{max} and I_{min} are light intensities at detectors D_2 and D_1 respectively. I_{min} and I_{max} are proportional to the squared moduli of the probability amplitudes summed at detectors D_1 and D_2 respectively. By the action of BS on the components $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\mathrm{V}\rangle$, reflected off MR_A, and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X[M,N]|\mathrm{H}\rangle + Y[M,N]|\mathrm{V}\rangle)$, exiting CQZE, we get,

$$Visibility = \frac{2Y[M,N]}{(X[M,N])^2 + (Y[M,N])^2 + 1}. \tag{3}$$

For instance, assuming ideal implementation, for the smallest number of outer and inner cycles, M=2 and N=2, interference visibility is already above 90%. While for M=2 and N=8, interference visibility is above 99%. FIG. 4 plots interference visibility for M up to 10 and N up to 100. We note that all elements of this scheme are implementable using current technology.

In Summary, we have shown how Bob can erase which-path information from Alice's photon counterfactually, that is without it ever leaving her station, dramatically restoring interference.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Sam L. Braunstein and Yuan Cao for useful comments. Qubet Research is a start-up in quantum communication technology.

[1] Scully MO, Druhl K. 1982 Quantum eraser: A proposed photon correlation experiment concerning observation and "delayed choice" in quantum mechanics. Phys. Rev. A **25**, 2208. (doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.25.2208)

[2] Bohr N. 1949 in Albert Einstein: Philosopher scientist. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[3] Einstein A, Podolsky P, Rosen N. 1935 Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? Phys. Rev. **47**, 777. (doi:10.1103/PhysRev.47.777)

[4] Kim YH, Yu R, Kulik SP, Shih Y, Scully MO. 2000 Delayed "choice" quantum eraser. Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1. (doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.84.1)

[5] Walborn SP, Terra Cunha MO, Padua S, Monken CH. 2002 Double-slit quantum eraser. Phys. Rev. A **65**, 033818. (doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.65.033818)

[6] Aharonov Y, Zubairy MS. 2005 Time and the quantum: erasing the past and impacting the future. Science **307**, 875-879. (doi:10.1126/science.1107787)

[7] Zhao TM, Zhang H, Yang J, Sang ZR, Jiang X, Bao XH, Pan JW. 2014 Entangling different-color photons via time-resolved measurement and active feed forward. Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 103602. (doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.103602)

[8] Salih H. 2016 Quantum erasure cryptography. Front. Phys. **4**, 16. (doi:10.3389/fphy.2016.00016)

[9] Hosten O, Rakher MT, Barreiro JT, Peters NA, Kwiat PG. 2006 Counterfactual quantum computation through quantum interrogation. Nature **439**, 94952. (doi:10.1038/nature04523)

[10] Salih H, Li Z-H, Al-Amri M, Zubairy MS. 2013 Protocol for direct counterfactual quantum communication. Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 170502. (doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.170502)

[11] Salih H. Tripartite counterfactual quantum cryptography. 2014 Phys. Rev. A **90**, 012333. (doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.90.012333)

[12] Salih H. 2016 Protocol for counterfactually transporting an unknown qubit. Front Phys. **3**, 94. (doi:10.3389/FPHY.2015.00094); Salih H. 2016 Protocol for counterfactually transporting an unknown qubit. arXiv:1404.2200.

[13] Vaidman L. 2014 Comment on "Protocol for direct counterfactual quantum communication." Phys Rev Lett. **112**, 208901. (doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.208901)

[14] Salih H, Li Z-H, Al-Amri M, Zubairy MS. 2014 Salih et al. reply. Phys Rev Lett. **112**, 208902. (doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.208902)

[15] Vaidman L. 2015 Counterfactuality of 'counterfactual' communication. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **48**, 465303. (doi:10.1088/1751-8113/48/46/465303)



FIG. 1. Which-path information destroys interference. Photon source S emits an H-photon towards the right. In this Michelson setup, interference of the photon components reflected off mirrors MR_A and MR_B means that detector D_2 always clicks. Optical delay OD ensures that effective path-lengths match. Optical circulator OC directs any photon coming from the right towards D_1. Flipping the polarisation of the photon component reflected by MR_A towards BS, by means of switchable polarisation rotator SPR, provides a which-path tag. Interference is then destroyed. Detectors D_1 and D_2 are now equally likely to click.



FIG. 2. The inner working of the Chained Quantum Zeno Effect (CQZE) for the case of Bob blocking the channel. We illustrate the operation of the CQZE using the minimum number of outer cycles, two. To start with, switchable mirror SM_1 is switched off letting Alice's H photon in before it is switched on again. Using switchable polarisation rotator SPR_1 the following rotation is applied to the photon, $|\mathrm{H}\rangle \rightarrow 1/\sqrt{2}(|\mathrm{H}\rangle + |\mathrm{V}\rangle)$, before it is switched off for the rest of this outer cycle. The V part of the superposition is reflected towards Bob using polarising beamsplitter PBS_1. Switchable mirror SM_2 is then switched off to let the V part of the superposition into the inner interferometer before it is switched on again. Using switchable polarisation rotator SPR_2, the following rotation, $|\mathrm{V}\rangle \rightarrow 1/\sqrt{2}(|\mathrm{V}\rangle - |\mathrm{H}\rangle)$, is then applied before it is switched off for the rest of this inner cycle. Polarising beamsplitter PBS_2 passes the H part of the superposition towards Bob while reflecting the V part. By blocking the channel, Bob effectively makes a measurement. Unless the photon is lost to D_B, the part of the photon superposition inside the inner interferometer ends up in the state $|\mathrm{V}\rangle$. The same applies for the next $N-1$ inner cycles. Switchable mirror SM_2 is then switched off to let this part of the superposition, whose state has remained $|\mathrm{V}\rangle$, out. In the next outer cycle, SPR_1 is switched on to rotate the photon's polarisation from $1/\sqrt{2}(|\mathrm{H}\rangle + |\mathrm{V}\rangle)$, assuming large N, to $|\mathrm{V}\rangle$, before it is switched off for the rest of the final outer cycle. PBS_1 reflects the photon towards Bob. As before, after N inner cycles, provided it is lost to D_4, the photon remains in the state $|\mathrm{V}\rangle$. Finally, SM_1 is switched off to allow the photon, whose final state is $|\mathrm{V}\rangle$, out. Optical delays OD ensure that effective path-lengths match.



FIG. 3. Counterfactual erasure. Photon source S emits an H-photon towards the right. Using the chained quantum Zeno effect (CQZE) module, the which-path tag imprinted by SPR can be erased. Blocking the channel, Bob counterfactually erases which-path information by flipping the polarisation of the photon component travelling horizontally towards him. We can be sure that the photon has not traversed the channel, otherwise D_B would have clicked. Interference is recovered, with D_2 virtually always clicking for large enough number of CQZE cycles.



FIG. 4. Interference visibility for number of outer cycles M up to 10, and number of inner cycles N up to 100. Visibility approaches unity for large N. Ideal implementation is assumed.